

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/774,888 02/01/2001		02/01/2001	Jun Koyama	740756-2255	3194
22204	7590	06/22/2006		EXAMINER	
NIXON PE		•	WEISS, HOWARD		
401 9TH STREET, NW SUITE 900				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2128				2814	
		DATE MAILED: 06/22/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

E	
---	--

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/774,888	KOYAMA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Howard Weiss	2814
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was a reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 Ap</u>	oril 2006.	·
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar		
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4)	vn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the Idrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive 1 (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on Noed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		į '
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>0406</u>. 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	

Attorney's Docket Number: 740756-2255

Filing Date: 2/1/01

Continuing Data: RCE established 3/27/03, 8/19/04 and 10/13/05

Claimed Foreign Priority Date: 2/1/00 (JPX)

Applicant(s): Koyama et al. (Kato)

Examiner: Howard Weiss

Claim Objections

1. Claims 81 to 83 recite the limitations "the floating gate" in Line 2 of each claim.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims.

- 2. Claim 80 recites the limitation "the layer adjacent to the first semiconductor active layer" in Line 29 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- 3. Claim 107 recites the limitation "the layer adjacent to the first semiconductor active layer" in Lines 1 and 2 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each

Application/Control Number: 09/774,888

Art Unit: 2814

claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1, 102 and 103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. (JP 11-154714 and the Derwent Translation of this document), Akbar (U.S. Patent No. 5,656,845), Miyawaki (U.S. Patent No. 5,808,336) and Tsutsumi (U.S. Patent No. 5,844,274).

Yamazaki et al. show most aspects of the instant invention (e.g. Figures 1 to 8) including:

- a memory cell array with memory cells formed in a matrix
- ➤ each cell containing a memory thin film transistor (MTFT) Tr1 and a switching thin film transistor (STFT) Tr2 said transistors integrally formed (Paragraph 0011 of Derwent)
- > said MTFT including:
 - a first semiconductor active layer 202 formed on an insulating substrate
 201, having a first thickness d1 and comprising a channel forming region
 205
 - o a first insulating film 211, a conductive layer (i.e. floating gate electrode)
 213 adjacent to the first semiconductive active layer and used to trap electrons, a second insulating film 214 and a control gate electrode 215
 - o a wiring 825 for connecting the control gate to a first single line 809
- > said STFT including:
 - o a second semiconductor active layer 206 formed on an insulating substrate 201 and having a second thickness d2
 - a gate insulating layer 212 and a gate electrode 217
 - a second signal line 810 connected to said gate electrode
- ➤ where in **d1** is thinner (i.e. smaller) than **d2** and within the ranges claimed (Paragraphs 0058 and 0059)

> the floating gate comprising tantalum or tantalum and the second insulating film made of a thermal oxide of said floating gate (i.e. tantalum oxide; Paragraphs 0149 to 0153)

Yamazaki et al. does not show the first and second semiconductor layer in a common semiconductor island, a first region of the floating gate having an area larger than a second region of the control gate and the control gate comprising a laminate of three films: TaN/W/WN. Akbar teaches (e.g. Figures 1 and 8 to 10) to form first and second semiconductor layers in a common semiconductor island (i.e. layer) 122 to provide memory cells with improved performance and reliability (Column 2 Lines 19 to 22). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to form first and second semiconductor layers in a common semiconductor island as taught by Akbar in the device of Yamazaki et al. to provide memory cells with improved performance and reliability.

Miyawaki teaches (e.g. Figures 4 and 5) to produce a first region of the floating gate 56 having an area larger than a second region of the control gate 51 to provide a storage device which can realize a large capacity, low cost, write enable, high read/write speed, high reliability, and low consumption power (Column 2 Lines 33 to 37). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to produce a first region of the floating gate having an area larger than a second region of the control gate as taught by Miyawaki in the device of Yamazaki et al. to provide a storage device which can realize a large capacity, low cost, write enable, high read/write speed, high reliability, and low consumption power.

Tsutsumi teaches (e.g. Column 17 Lines 14 to 20) it is common, and therefore obvious, to form gate electrodes of layers comprising TaN/W/WN. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to form gate electrodes of layers comprising TaN/W/WN as taught by Tsutsumi in the device of Yamazaki et al. since it is common in the art to do so.

6. Claims 77 to 84, 87 to 90, 93 to 96 and 104 to 107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al., Akbar, Miyawaki and Tsutsumi, as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Koyama (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,344).

Yamazaki et al., Akbar Miyawaki and Tsutsumi show most aspects of the instant invention (Paragraph 5) except for the semiconductor device comprising a substrate, a non-volatile memory over the substrate, a pixel portion over the substrate, a source wiring driver circuit for driving the pixel portion over the substrate, a gate wiring driver circuit for driving the pixel portion over the substrate, a correction circuit over the substrate and a memory controller circuit over the substrate for controlling the non-volatile memory circuit all part of an LCD of a video camera. Koyama teach (Paragraph 3) to use the memory device with the listed devices to produce a high quality display device (Column 7 Lines 55 to 61). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the memory device of Yamazaki et al., Akbar Miyawaki and Tsutsumi with the listed devices of Koyama to produce a high quality display device.

7. Claims 97 to 101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al., Akbar, Miyawaki, Tsutsumi and Koyama, as applied to Claims 1, 77, 78, 79 and 80 above, and further in view of Fukaya et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,627,088).

Yamazaki et al., Akbar, Miyawaki, Tsutsumi and Koyama show most aspects of the instant invention (Paragraph 6) except for the use of amorphous silicon germanium. Fukaya et al. teach (e.g. Column 11 Lines 8 to 10) to use amorphous silicon germanium as a semiconductor layer in an LCD device to provide an alternative semiconductor material. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use amorphous silicon germanium as a semiconductor layer in an LCD device as taught by Fukaya et al. in the device of

Yamazaki et al., Akbar, Miyawaki, Tsutsumi and Koyama to provide an alternative semiconductor material.

Double Patenting

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 1 and 77 to 84, 87 to 90, 93 to 96 and 103 to 107 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1 to 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,472,684 in view of Yamazaki et al., Akbar, Miyawaki, Tsutsumi and Koyama. U.S. Patent No. 6,472,684 claim most aspects of the instant except for a first region of the floating gate having an area larger than a second region of the control gate, the first and second semiconductor layer a common semiconductor island, the floating gate comprising tantalum, the second insulating film comprising a thermal oxide of said floating gate and being part of the listed elements (i.e. a substrate, a non-volatile memory over the substrate, a pixel portion over the substrate, a source wiring driver circuit for driving the pixel portion over the substrate, a correction circuit over the substrate and a memory controller circuit over the substrate for controlling the non-volatile memory circuit all

part of an LCD of a video camera) and to form gate electrodes of layers comprising TaN/W/WN.

Akbar teaches (e.g. Figures 1, 9 and 10) to form first and second semiconductor layers in a continuous layer 122 to provide memory cells with improved performance and reliability (Column 2 Lines 19 to 22). Yamazaki et al. teach (e.g. Paragraphs 0149 to 0153)) to use tantalum in the floating gate and a thermal oxide of the floating gate as the second insulating film to improve the electrical characteristics of the device. Koyama teach (Paragraph 7) to use the memory device with the listed devices to produce a high quality display device (Column 7 Lines 55 to 61). Miyawaki teaches (e.g. Figures 4 and 5) to produce a first region of the floating gate 56 having an area larger than a second region of the control gate 51 to provide a storage device which can realize a large capacity, low cost, write enable, high read/write speed; high reliability, and low consumption power (Column 2 Lines 33 to Tsutsumi teaches (e.g. Column 17 Lines 14 to 20) it is common, and therefore obvious, to form gate electrodes of layers comprising TaN/W/WN. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to produce a first region of the floating gate having an area larger than a second region of the control gate as taught by Miyawaki, to form gate electrodes of layers comprising TaN/W/WN as taught by Tsutsumi, to form first and second semiconductor layers in a continuous layer as taught by Akbar, to use tantalum in the floating gate and a thermal oxide of the floating hate as the second insulating film as taught by Yamazaki et al. and to use the memory device with the listed devices as taught by Koyama in the device claimed in U.S. Patent No. 6,472,684 to provide a device with improved performance and reliability.

10. Claims 1 and 77 to 84, 87 to 90, 93 to 96 and 103 to 107 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1 to 30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,509,602 in view of Yamazaki et al., Akbar, Miyawaki, Tsutsumi and Koyama. U.S. Patent No. 6,509,602 claim

most aspects of the instant except for a first region of the floating gate having an area larger than a second region of the control gate, the first and second semiconductor layer a common semiconductor island, the floating gate comprising tantalum, the second insulating film comprising a thermal oxide of said floating gate and being part of the listed elements (i.e. a substrate, a non-volatile memory over the substrate, a pixel portion over the substrate, a source wiring driver circuit for driving the pixel portion over the substrate, a gate wiring driver circuit for driving the pixel portion over the substrate, a correction circuit over the substrate and a memory controller circuit over the substrate for controlling the non-volatile memory circuit all part of an LCD of a video camera) and to form gate electrodes of layers comprising TaN/W/WN.

Akbar teaches (e.g. Figures 1, 9 and 10) to form first and second semiconductor layers in a continuous layer 122 to provide memory cells with improved performance and reliability (Column 2 Lines 19 to 22). Yamazaki et al. teach (e.g. Paragraphs 0149 to 0153)) to use tantalum in the floating gate and a thermal oxide of the floating hate as the second insulating film to improve the electrical characteristics of the device. Koyama teach (Paragraph 2) to use the memory device with the listed devices to produce a high quality display device (Column 7 Lines 55 to 61). Miyawaki teaches (e.g. Figures 4 and 5) to produce a first region of the floating gate 56 having an area larger than a second region of the control gate 51 to provide a storage device which can realize a large capacity, low cost, write enable, high read/write speed, high reliability, and low consumption power (Column 2 Lines 33 to 37) Tsutsumi teaches (e.g. Column 17 Lines 14 to 20) it is common, and therefore obvious, to form gate electrodes of layers comprising TaN/W/WN. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to produce a first region of the floating gate having an area larger than a second region of the control gate as taught by Miyawaki, to form gate electrodes of layers comprising TaN/W/N as taught by Tsutsumi, to form first and second semiconductor layers in a continuous layer as taught by Akbar, to use tantalum in

the floating gate and a thermal oxide of the floating hate as the second insulating film as taught by Yamazaki et al. and to use the memory device with the listed devices as taught by Koyama in the device claimed in U.S. Patent No. 6,509,602 to provide a device with improved performance and reliability.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1, 77 to 84, 87 to 90 and 93 to 107 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to combine the references can be found in each reference as indicated in the rejections above.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing

date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

- 13. Papers related to this application may be submitted directly to Art Unit 2814 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (15 November 1989). The Art Unit 2814 Fax Center number is (571) 273-8300. The Art Unit 2814 Fax Center is to be used only for papers related to Art Unit 2814 applications.
- 14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Howard Weiss at (571) 272-1720 and between the hours of 7:00 AM to 3:00 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday or by e-mail via Howard.Weiss@uspto.gov. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy, can be reached on (571) 272-1705.
- 15. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

16. The following list is the Examiner's field of search for the present Office Action:

Field of Search	Dete	
U.S. Class / Subclass(es): 257/326, 347; 365/ 185.05	thru 6/12/2006	
Other Documentation: none		
Electronic Database(s): EAST	thru 6/12/2006	

HW/hw 13 June 2006 Howard Weiss Primary Examiner Art Unit 2814